

MR. SMITH ON CERATHOSIA.

BY A. R. GROTE, A. M., BREMEN.

In reply to Mr. Smith's paper, somewhat inappropriately styled "*Arctiidae vs. Noctuidae*," I would state that my original paper in Entom. Amer. on *Cerathosia* had for its *main* object the pointing out of the errors contained in Mr. Smith's original description of the genus in the neururation. When these errors are corrected according to my statements (which latter in the main seem to be acknowledged by Mr. Smith as correct), the probability that the moth is an *Arctian* next to *Utetheisa* is weakened, and, as I have shown it is not a *Lithosian*, the chances are we must look for its position elsewhere. The *secondary* object of my paper was to suggest that we might find a better place for *Cerathosia* next to *Acopa*, etc., in the *Noctuidae*. Now, in reply to Mr. Moeschler, and Mr. Smith, I have to say, that I did not discuss vein 8 of *Cerathosia*. I have also to complain that Mr. Smith is an unfair writer, who indulges in large expressions of condemnation upon small grounds (as for instance the fact that some *Lithosians* have an accessory cell, while I give no accessory cell as a character of the sub-family), and above all a writer who misrepresents the party he desires to criticize. Mr. Smith alludes to a paper on *Cerathosia* "not yet reached." I advise him when that paper is reached, to have any statement it may contain as to the neururation of *Cerathosia* corrected according to my original corrections. I have no objections to my writings being "handled without gloves," as Prof. Fernald says Mr. Smith does, when the criticism is fair and reasonable.

A FINAL WORD ABOUT THE GENUS RILEYA.

BY WM. H. ASHMEAD.

In the last issue of the CAN. ENT. Mr. Howard, with a commendable solicitude for my entomological reputation, and under a heavy discharge of deadly parallel columns, seeks to evade the question at issue between us, *i. e.*, who has priority in the use of the generic term *Rileyia*; and notwithstanding the opportunity was afforded him to rechristen his interesting genus, he seems loath to do so, and again, by a misrepresentation, makes a claim of priority in publication.

Had Mr. Howard written *read* instead of "published," he would have been nearer the truth. However, this may have been another *lapsus*

pennæ. His published description first appeared in the October number of the CAN. ENT., nearly five months after the publication of "my synoptic tables," as previously pointed out by me, and the points claimed by him are without value.

In order to close a controversy that has already assumed an inconsistent warmth, I now propose for Mr. Howard's genus the name *Chrysoplatycerus*, and the species may in future be known as *Chrysoplatycerus splendens* Howard.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A FLOCK OF BUTTERFLIES.

Dear Sir: While in the interior of New Guinea, in Aug., 1883, I observed what might properly be called a flock of butterflies. They were apparently of one species* (of a dark brown color, with a blue reflection on the fore wings in a certain light), and in such great numbers as to actually blacken the green bushes on which they lit. I first came across them one day, while out after birds, in a thick and shaded part of the tall forest, in low land adjoining the Laloki river. Being so numerous, I supposed it would be an easy matter to catch all I desired without the aid of a net, but after several unsuccessful attempts, in which case they would rise in a cloud and settle again in a few moments on the bushes close at hand, I was obliged to give it up. They did not seem to be very much disturbed at my approach, but would not, however, allow me to get very near without taking flight. As soon as I remained still, they would immediately settle on bushes and foliage close by, but always out of reach. The flock was, perhaps, two acres in extent, but the butterflies were not equally numerous over this entire area. In some places every bush, branch, twig and leaf seemed to be covered with them, while in others there were comparatively few. What their object was, or how long they remained in that locality, I am unable to say, except that in visiting the place several days afterwards, they were still there in apparently undiminished numbers. I might add none were seen feeding, and, so far as I observed, there were no flowers in bloom anywhere in the vicinity.

S. W. DENTON, Wellesley, Mass.

* The name is unknown to me, but I have a specimen of this butterfly which, if returned, I will send to any person who is capable and willing to determine it.